

A N  
EXERCITATION

CONCERNING

The true Time of Our  
**Saviour's Passover:**

BEING

PART of a DIGRESSION

In the *Additions* to the

**S E R M O N**

Before Sir P. W.

---

By *John Turner*, late Fellow of *Christ's College* in *Cambridge*.

---

*-----Stulta est clementia, cum tot ubique  
Vatibus occurras, peritura parcere Chartæ.*

---

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Walter Kettilby* at the Bishop's Head in  
*St. Paul's Church-Yard*. 1684.

AN  
EXERCITATION



The title of our  
*Huntington Brown*

sermon

BEING  
PART of a DISSESSION

IN THE  
SERMON

Before Sir A. W.

By the Rev. Mr. [illegible]  
of the [illegible] Church

Printed at the [illegible] Press  
in the [illegible] Street

LONDON:  
Printed by [illegible] at the [illegible] Press

Reverendo admodum Patri,

ET

Antiqui Generis Morisque Viro,

**HENDERICO,**

Antistiti Meritissimo,

**LONDINATUM, &c.**

**JOANNES TURNER** ex voto

P.

**A**ccipias placido, Præsul Clarissime, vultu  
Quæ tibi *Grantigenæ* subvehit unda *Camæ*.

Namque *Camus* quondam sacros mihi præbuit haustus,

Fovit & in blando *Granta* benigna sinu.

Ille quidem largo Fluvius non labitur amne,

Nec vehit auriferas *Gangis* ad instar aquas.

Sed *Camus Angliacis* dat nomina docta *Camænis*,

Dat decus & titulis surgit ubique novis.

## DEDICATIO.

*Coulius* hîc quondam est viridanti auditus in herba,

*Tinnula Threiciis* plectra ciere modis.

Hîc cecinit cassos *Vates* neglectus amores.

Subque tuo gemuit, *Cypria Diva*, jugo.

Traditur hîc vivos rosisse *Barvius* ungues,

Cui nihil arcanti non patuisse ferunt.

Ille omnes linguas & *Musas* caluit omnes.

Ah! nimium vitæ prodigus ille fuit.

Quid referam *Heroas* longo quos ordine monstrat

Quæ micat hâc Cœli fulgida luce dies?

Vix habet æquales *Oxania Mater* alumnos,

Nec beat *Isiacas* laus magis alta domos.

Unum te nobis superi si forte dedissent,

Vix superis dandum, quod superesset, erat.

Tu columen rerum, tu lux, tu sacra salutis

*Anchora* & *Arctoi* tu *Cynosura* poli.

Tu benè pacatis firmas altaria bellis,

Atque togæ posito corripis arma sago.

Te *Bellona* suum, te *Pax* agnoscat alumnum,

Condecorântque tuas, LAURUS, OLIVA, Comas.

*Martis* habes animos, linguam ingeniûmque *Minervæ*,

Et tumet ancipiti mens cumulatâ Deo.



## DEDICATIO.

Non proavos jactas nec avita in stirpe superbis,

Nec genus in laudes cogitur ire tuas.

Sed facis egelidas in te revirescere manes,

Plurisque refers genti quàm dedit illa tibi.

O, quàm te memorem *COMPTONI* nobilis Heros,

Lumen idem Patriæ deliciæque tuæ.

O, mihi si centum linguæ, centum ora fuissent,

Doctæque centenâ chorda sonare manu;

Omnis lingua tuos, os omne sonaret honores;

Tactæque centeno pectine sacra chelys.

Quàm pulchrè excelsi cavit Moderator *Olympi*:

Ut benè res Patriæ Religionis eant,

Cùm *Lambetha Parens* *GUIELMO* Principe gestit.

Et magnum *HENRICI* Numen in *Urbe* viget.

Scilicet à tantis Ecclesia fulta columnis,

Non timet à rabido *Schismate* posse quati;

Sed secura sui longum jam pergit in ævum,

Pergat, io! auspiciis usque beata novis.

Tu quoque Patricio Pastor præfulgidus ortu:

Perge tuo populos pascere more tuos.

Perge salutiferam dextrâ numerare senectam,

*Nestoris* & *Pylis* canus adire dies.

## DEDICATIO.

Quo tu plura animi possis monumenta verendi

Spargere & exemplis auctior esse bonis.

Hei mihi! qui referens tanto Patri,

Non possim ex inopi promere digna penu;

Digna tuis meritis & nostrâ digna parente

Quæ me Castaliis edidit alma jugis.

Tu tamen accipies animum pro thure colentis,

Digna relaturus, si potuisset, erat.

Accipies placido, Præsul Clarissime, vultu

Quæ tibi *Grantigenæ* subvehit unda *Cami*.

J. I.

---

THE

# THE CONTENTS.

**T**HE Time of our Saviour's Passover assigned; viz.  
upon the Evening of the Fourteenth of Nisan,  
Page 98.

Four places of Scripture produced to justify this opinion;  
p. 99, 100.

Μεγάλη ἡμέρα what, and the error of Bochartus noted,  
p. 101, 102.

Μεγάλη κυριακή for Easter Sunday and why, p. 102, 103.  
Tessarescaidecatiz who, p. 102.

A fifth place of Scripture produced to confirm this notion  
concerning the true time of our Saviour's last Supper,  
which yet does not prove so certainly as the other four,  
p. 103.

Upon what account it was necessary that our blessed Lord  
should suffer at that very time when the Passover was  
to be killed among the Jews, p. 103, 104.

Three places of Scripture alledged in favour of a contrary o-  
pinion, that our Saviour's last Supper was celebrated  
upon the true time of the Jewish Passover, and not the  
night before it, as I have affirmed. p. 104, 105.

A general answer to all these three places, p. 105.  
A more particular answer, ibid.

Objection. How comes it to pass that the Parasceue, or  
preparation to the Passover, is in the three places last  
mentioned, called the first day of unleavened Bread,  
and the day of unleavened Bread? p. 106.

Two Answers to the Objection, the first not much relied up-  
on, but the second confirmed by an observation of Capel-  
lus

## The Contents.

- Ius and Grotius, and by comparing of two testimonies  
alleged from Josephus,* p. 106, 107.  
*To the five places that have been mentioned above, and  
which are all of them produced by Bochartus, with a  
design to answer and elude their force, there is a sixth  
added to strengthen my opinion.* p. 108.  
*Bochartus his evasion of the first of those five places con-  
sidered and refuted,* p. 108, 109.  
*Περί τῆς ἑορτῆς, τοῦ πάσχα, τοῦ ἑβδόμου ἡμέρας,* ibid.  
*Dr. Lightfoot's evasion of this place, though in it self false,  
yet much more plausible than that of Bochartus,* p. 109.  
*Grotius concurs in opinion with me, that this first place  
is to be interpreted of the last Supper in opposition to  
Dr. Lightfoot,* ibid.  
*The word Passover in the second place cannot be understood  
of the Chagigah, as Bochartus would have it, proved  
at large,* p. 109, 110, 111.  
*Παρασκευή ἢ πᾶσχα, or the preparation of the Passover  
in the third place, cannot be understood of the Passover  
it self, but onely of the day before it proved,* p. 111, 112.  
*Σάββατον δὲ δεύτερον, or the second Sabbath after the  
first, what,* p. 112.  
*Reasons given to strengthen my opinion from the nature of  
the Sacrifice of Christ compared with those types by which  
it was shadowed out under the Law,* p. 113, 114.  
*Had our Saviour suffered upon the first day of unleavened  
Bread, he would not have answered to the Passover but  
the Chagigah.* ibid.  
*The general ignorance of all, both ancient and modern Wri-  
ters, what the true meaning of the Sabbatum deutero-  
protum should be,* p. 114, 115.  
*Scaliger's conjecture why rejected by Grotius and Capellus,*  
p. 115.  
*Scaliger's conjecture laid down, and the insufficiency of it  
shewn in five particulars,* p. 115, 116, 117.  
*The*

## The Contents.

*The Sabbatum deuteroprotum in St. Luke fell certainly upon the Saturday or Jewish Sabbath properly so called,*

p. 117.

*The absurdity of Scaliger's opinion upon supposition that it always falls upon this day,*

p. 117, 118.

*Grotius his opinion proposed and rejected in five particulars,*

p. 118, 119, 120.

*The conjecture of Capellus depending upon two different accounts of the Jewish year proposed,*

p. 120, 121.

*And proved largely that there neither were nor could be two such different accounts,*

from p. 121 to 128.

*Muā, Mām, Mensis, Moon, Month, Almenick or Almanack, all from the Hebrew Manah, numeravit, p. 124.*

*The places of Scripture producible in favour of the different account considered,*

p. 125, 126.

*Teshoubath hashanah, Tekoupath hashanah, in Hebrew, what,*

ibid.

*Shanah, ἐνιαυτός, annus,*

p. 126, 127.

*Tseth hashanah, what; together with a discovery of the mistake of the LXX. and other interpreters, p. 127, 128.*

*And through this whole Discourse it is undeniably proved that the Jews had no other way of computation but by the motion of the Moon, nor any other way of equation to reduce the Lunar and Solar years to a balance, but by an intercalary month at the latter end of the year.*

*Orach, Jareach, Κεῖρα, Saturnus, what and whence,*

p. 128, 129.

*Ῥέα, Diana, Ἀρtemis,*

p. 129, 130.

*Cynthia, Cybele, Berecynthia, Οὐδς, Tohu, 𐤒𐤕, p. 130.*

*Σιδε, Sibylla, Chofhek, 𐤕𐤁𐤁, 𐤕𐤁𐤁𐤁, Tehom, p. 131.*

*Κυων, Σκυων, Σκύβαλον, Latrare, ibid.*

*A citation produced out of Clemens Alexandrinus to justify my opinion.*

p. 132.

*The mistakes of Epiphanius and Chrysostome concerning this.*

## The Contents.

- this matter, together with the monstrous absurdity of*  
*Isidore Pelusiota,* p. 132, 133.
- Agaw, agitare, words proper and peculiar to festival solemnities, and other considerations produced to prove that our Saviour's last Supper was on the Vigil of the Sab-  
 batum deuteroprotum.* p. 133, 134.
- The last place which is endeavoured to be eluded by Bochartus farther considered, and the testimony of Clemens Alexandrinus improved against him, for the asserting of my notion of the μεσάλη ἡμέρα,* p. 134, 135.
- The time of our Saviour's Supper being cleared, it is variously disputed by learned men how he could eat the Paschal Lamb the night before the Jews ate theirs, and for this they have proposed several expedients; First, That the Jews followed the Traditions of the Masters contained in certain Talmudical Canons, while our Saviour rejecting their Traditions adhered strictly to the Letter of the Law, but it is abundantly proved that there were no such Talmudical Canons as are pretended, any where used in our Saviour's time.* from p. 134 to 137.
- The second Expedient founded in the difference betwixt the Astronomical conjunction and the sensible Phasis, and the vanity of it abundantly detected.* p. 137.
- The third Expedient of Capellus from the embolism or intercalation of a day in the Jewish Calendar precarious, and all these three expedients sufficiently refuted from Joh. 13. 29. A fourth Expedient, from the Jews observation of two days together precarious as to the ancient Jews,* p. 138.
- Nay, it is not onely precarious, but plainly false, as is abundantly proved from the confession of Maimonides himself that there never was any such custome at Jerusalem among the ancient Jews, and from several other reasons,* p. 139.
- The Conclusion,* p. 140.
- A N

A N  
EXERCITATION  
Concerning the true Time of  
OUR SAVIOUR'S  
Last Supper  
• WITH HIS  
DISCIPLES.

**F**OR the time of our Saviour's Passover, I affirm, that it was upon the evening of the fourteenth of *Nisan*, being the night before the *Jews* by the prescription of the *Mosaick* Law were to celebrate theirs; and, for the proof of this, I shall produce these following places of Scripture in that order in which they are set down but not answered by the late excellent and profoundly learned *Samuel Bochartus*, who being dead, yet speaketh, and whose Works will follow him through all generations laden with the spoils of industry, and the rewards of praise as long as civility and learning shall endure; but it is excusable in those that write so much to be sometimes mistaken, and it is usually seen that the errors of great men are like themselves.

He therefore in his *Hieroicoicon*, in that Chapter where he discourses of the Paschal-lamb, hath ranged those Scriptures which he pretends to answer in the following order.

The first is *Joh. 13. 1.* Now before the Feast of the Passover, when Jesus knew that his hour was come. And then,



v. 2. *And supper being ended, &c.* From whence the Argument is clear, that if this place be to be understood of his last Supper with his Disciples, then that last Supper was before the Feast of the Passover.

The second place is the eighteenth Chapter of the same Gospel at the 28. verse, *Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas unto the hall of judgment: and it was early, and they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled: but that they might eat the Passover.* Now this happening, as it did, the day after, or rather the very same day when our Saviour ate his Passover with his Disciples, whereas the Jews were not to eat theirs till the night following; it is manifest our Saviour's Passover was a night before theirs.

The third place is Chap. 19. v. 14. *And it was the preparation of the Passover, and about the sixth hour: and he (that is, Pilate) saith unto the Jews, Behold your King.* Now if Christ were betray'd and carryed before Pilate upon the Preparation of the Passover, then the Jewish Passover was not yet come; for the Parasceve or Preparation of any Feast was the day before it.

The fourth place is the 31. verse of the same Chapter, *The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the Sabbath day (for that Sabbath day was an high day) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away.* In which words there are two things to be considered. First, We have it again plainly asserted that it was the preparation of the Sabbath, which Sabbath this year was coincident with the Passover it self. Secondly, It is said, *That that Sabbath day was an high day* ἡ γὰρ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ὅτι ἐκεῖν τὸ Σαββάτον.

And what the meaning of a great or high day is, you may see from *Isay. 1. 13. the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies I cannot away with.* Where the LXX.



render it thus, τὰς νεμενίας ὑμῶν, καὶ τὰ σάββατα καὶ ἡμέραν  
 μεγάλην ἐκ ἀνέχομαι · where the calling of assemblies is  
 rendered by ἡμέρα μεγάλη, the great, or high day, which in  
 other places is termed an holy convocation, by which is  
 meant the first and last day of the three great Feasts  
 which were kept for seven days together, in the first and  
 last of which there was a more extraordinary concourse  
 of the People, and besides, a Sabbath or day of Rest from  
 all manner of secular imploiment; which notion if *Bo-*  
*chartus* had understood so thoroughly as he should have  
 done, if he had known that the seventh day of a Feast  
 was as well μεγάλη ἡμέρα, a great, or high day, as the  
 first, though it was not equally so, for by this time most  
 of those that lived at any distance from Jerusalem were  
 gone home; he would not have uttered these words,  
*Quin apud Judæos nullum fuit Festum in quod non quadret*  
*hoc nomen*, that there was no Feast-day among the Jews  
 which might not properly enough be called a great, or  
 high day; for which he cites that Text of *Joh. c. 7. v. 37.*  
 speaking of the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles, ἐν  
 τῇ ἑσπέρῃ ἡμέρᾳ, τῇ μεγάλῃ τῇ ἑσπέρῃ, in the last day, that  
 great day of the Feast; neither is this any more than  
 what is usual in our own Age, as *Bochartus* could not  
 chuse but know; for what day or night is so guilty of  
 excess and riot as that which is the last of the Carnival  
 in Popish Countries? and here, among our selves, the  
 Solemnities of Twelfth tide and Candlemass are in a manner  
 equal to that of Christmas day. *Procopius* himself whose  
 Authority is produced by *Bochartus* may be sufficient to  
 put him to silence, his words are these, expressly asser-  
 ting a great, or high day to be, πάντων τῶν ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κα-  
 λεμένων κληῖνῶν, οἷα ἡ πρώτη καὶ ἡ ἑσπέρη τῇ ἀζύμῳ, καὶ  
 ἡ ἑσπέρη πεντηκοστῆς, καὶ ἡ δεκάτη τῆς μηνὸς, καὶ πάντα ἀπόλως  
 ἑσπέρημοι ἑσπέραι· that is, every day which is termed an ho-  
 ly convocation, as the first and seventh day of Unleavened-  
 bread,

bread, the day of Pentecost, the tenth day of the month (Tisri,) and, in one word, every more remarkable or extraordinary Feast-day. But you see he expressly tells us as to the Feast of the Passover, that onely the first and seventh were *μεγάλοι ἡμέραι*, great, or high days; and the same is to be understood of the Feast of Pentecost, or Weeks, and of the Feast of Tabernacles; for the latter of which we have the express Authority of Saint John, it being absurd to call the seventh day of the Feast, *μεγάλη ἡμέρα ἡ ἐορτή*, the great, or high day of the feast; if all the seven daies were so as well as that, so that Bochartus his darling Testimony does sufficiently confute that opinion which he endeavours to establish upon it; for that which he designs to prove is, that the second-day of Unleavened-bread, upon the approach of which he supposes our Saviour to have suffered, was a great, or high day, which this Testimony will by no means doe, nor that of Procopius neither. Since therefore it is agreed on all hands, that our Saviour did not suffer upon the seventh day of Unleavened-bread, or upon the approach of it, what can be more plain, than that he underwent his Passion upon the approach of the Feast, at that very time when the Paschal-lamb was to be slain? and from hence it is, though I did not intend to have betray'd that Secret now, that *Easter sunday*, by the ancient Greek Church, was called *ἡ μεγάλη Κυριακή*, the great, or high Sunday, as I have seen it in their Liturgies, both in Manuscript and printed. For although the *Tessarescaidecatita*, so called from their following the Jewish account, celebrated their Easter upon any day of the week indifferently, as Eusebius, Epiphanius, Saint Austin, Theodoret and Philastrius assure us; yet it was the general way of the Church, which we retain, to celebrate it upon the Sunday after the anniversary of the Passion, which being coincident with an ordinary or weekly commemoration of the

the Resurrection, which every Sunday is, was called *the great, or high Sunday*, as well because of the concurrence as it were of two Holydaies in one, as for that this being our Christian Passover, it answers to the first day of Unleavened bread, which was an Holy Convocation among the *Jews*.

The last place mentioned by *Bechartus* is *Matt. 26. 5.* *But they said, Not on the Feast-day, lest there be an uprore among the people.* Which place, to speak truly, proves nothing either way. For thus much is certain, that the *Jews* were wont to put to death notorious Malefactours, and such some of them looked upon our Saviour, and others would have had him thought to be upon the Preparation of their solemn Feast-days, when there was a general conflux of the People, that so the Punishment might be of greater example; but at this time, because of the great reputation and esteem which our Blessed Lord had gained among the People, it was resolved among the Chief-priests and Scribes, that his Crucifixion should not be on the Feast-day, lest the Concern of the People for him might occasion a Tumult: but now it being clear that the Concourse would be in a manner equal either on the first day of Unleavened-bread or on the day before it, when all that were to partake of the Passover were actually come to *Jerusalem* to prepare themselves in order to it; we must refer it wholly to the Providence of God, who put it into the hearts of the Chief-priests and Scribes, upon occasion of *Judas* his betraying him, to doe what they designed at a time when they did not design it, that so he might approve himself to be *Christ our Passover*, as *Saint Paul* calls him; and *the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world* in the Divine Decree; but not to be brought actually to the Slaughter untill this *fulness of time*.

For this reason it was that *not a bone of him was broken*, when the Theives who were crucify'd together with him, not being yet actually dead, were dispatch'd this way; becaule a bone of the Passover was not to be broken; for this reason he expired at the ninth hour, that is, about three in the afternoon, the very time when the Passover was to be killed; for this reason he came to *Jerusalem*, as *Bochartus* himself ingeniously and learnedly observes, upon the tenth of *Nisan*, the time when the Passovers, according to the Law of *Moses*, were to be set by for Sacrifices on the fourteenth; and for the same reason it was, as the same Learned man conjectures, that he began to preach in the thirtieth year of his age, (which being the perfect age of a man in his full strength and vigour, answers to the Passover of a year old) and he continued preaching till his thirty fourth year, where, if you take years for daies, in the Prophetick style, his entring upon his Preaching in his thirtieth year, will be as it were his setting apart, in order to his being a Sacrifice in the thirty fourth.

Lastly, Our Saviour himself expressly saies, *Matt. 26. v. 2. Ye know that after two days is the feast of the Passover, and the Son of man is betrayed to be crucified*; because in his Person and Sufferings at that time the meaning and intention of all the Paschal Sacrifices under the Law was to be fulfilled.

Against so plain and so manifold evidence of Scripture, to prove that our Saviour's Supper with his Disciples was the night before the Passover of the *Jews*, there are but three Places that I know of produced in favour of the contrary opinion, which if they had been so well understood as, I hope, they will be hereafter, had, instead of confirming that opinion, overthrown it.

The first is *Matt. 26. v. 17. Now the first day of the feast of unleavened-bread the disciples came to Jesus, say-*  
*ing*

ing unto him, *Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the Passover?*

The second is *Mark 14. 12.* *And the first day of unleavened-bread, when they killed the Passover, his disciples said unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and prepare, that thou mayst eat the Passover?*

The third and last place is that of *Luke 22. 7.* *Then came the day of unleavened-bread, when the Passover must be killed.*

In which Places, if those Learned men who have stood up in defence of the *Latin Church*, had observed that upon this first day of Unleavened-bread (wherein the stress of their Argument lies) the Passover was to be killed, they would then have concluded, that this first day could not be any of those seven mentioned in *Exodus*, the first and last of which were to be an *Holy Convocation*. For it was the day before the first of these that the Passover was to be killed, that is to say, about three of the clock in the afternoon upon the fourteenth of *Nisan*, whereas the Feast upon the Paschal-lamb was to begin upon the beginning of the fifteenth, which was at six of the clock that evening.

Besides, it is worth our while to observe the particular Phrases by which the two latter Evangelists *St. Mark* and *St. Luke* have expressed themselves; *in which they killed the Passover*, saith *Saint Mark*, that is, when it was the usual custom of the *Jews* to kill their Passover, which was, as I have said, upon the fourteenth of *Nisan*, which answers to part of our months of *March*, and *April*; but *Saint Luke* is still more express, ἐν ᾗ ἔδει δοῦναι τὸ πάχα, *when the Passover must be killed*; or, as a man would express it in *Latin*, *quo die solenne erat ex præscripto Legis, ex instituto Moysis, ex Hebræorum disciplina, ex præcepto Dei ut mactaretur Pascha.*

But then you will ask how it comes to pass, that the *Parasceve*, or *Preparation* to the Passover is called *the first day of unleavened-bread*? to which I answer, that, first, we may look upon it as a *Roman* way of speaking, of which there are many in the *New Testament*, as there must needs be in the Language of those times when *Judæa* was become a *Roman Province*, and so *πρώτη τῆς ἀζύμων* is as much as *πρώτη πρὸ τῆς ἀζύμων* as in *Latin*, *Pridie calendarum* is *Primo die calendarum*, that is, *Primo die ante calendas*.

But this, though it cannot be deny'd by any that have a distinguishing palate in these matters, to be a very plausible conjecture, yet I must confess ingenuously, I do not think it to be true, and therefore I shall not stand upon it.

That which I take to be the very truth is this, That upon this day the Unleavened-cakes were made, and the Leaven purged out of all the *Jewish* houses, in order to the Feast, which is the present practice of the *Jews*, as you may see in *Buxtorf*, in his *Synagoga Judaica*; and to both of these it is that Saint *Paul* alludes, *1 Cor. c. 5. v. 7.* Ἐκκαθάρατε ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ ζύμῳ, ἵνα ᾦτε νέον φέζμα, ὡς ἔστε ἀζύμοι. *Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened.* *Ludovicus Capellus*, in his *Epicrisis* against *Cloppenburge*, somewhere observes, that the Leaven is usually purged out of all the *Jewish* houses, by one of the clock upon the day of the Preparation, which is two hours before the Passover was to be killed, and therefore that day wherein this was done might well enough be called by a *Synecdoche* of the part for the whole, *the first day of unleavened-bread*, not because any Unleavened-bread was eaten that day, but because upon that day it was made in order to the Feast, and because after such a certain time there was no Leaven to be found; to which purpose the words of *Grotius* up-



on *Matt.* 26. 17. are considerable, *Incipiebant autem Judæi locum in quo comesturi erant Pascha parare ab ea nocte quæ antecedit solem decimum quartum & pars est & vñ. ἑνὴς decimi quarti, quod nunc etiam faciunt; ejus præparationis magna est pars anxia ἐκκλῆδατος τῆς ἑβδόμης, ad quam alludit Paulus, 1 Cor. 5. 7. sollicitè enim eà nocte & antemeridiano tempore sequenti, inquirunt ecquid usquam fermentatum superfit, etiam micas colligentes: and upon this account it is that Josephus in the Third of his *Antiquities*, speaking of the Feast of Unleavened-bread, speaks of it in the most proper acceptation of those words, for that Feast of seven daies continuance, wherein there was no Leaven to be touched or eaten; πένθητι καὶ δεκάτη, saith he, διὰ δὲ χεῖλαι τὴν & πᾶσα ἡ τῆς ἑβδόμης ἐστὶν ἐστὶν ἡμέρας ὅσα· upon the fifteenth of Nisan, after the feast of the Passover follows the feast of Unleavened-bread, which continues for seven daies. But in his Second Book, speaking of the same Feast, he saies, Ἐορτῶν ἄγουμεν ἐπ' ἡμέρας ὀκτώ· We celebrate the feast of Unleavened-bread for eight daies together. In which last place it is manifest he must of necessity include the Preparation to the Feast as well as the Feast it self, otherwise his eight days will want one of their number.*

Having thus vindicated these three Texts of the Evangelists, Saint *Matthew*, *Mark* and *Luke*, from the false Interpretations which the *Latin Church* and their Defenders, whether among themselves or of the Reformation, have made, and shown that these very places do equally conspire with the rest to overthrow the opinion of that Infallible Dictatress, the Church of *Rome*, and of all that in this particular have taken her part; I will now add one Text more to confirm what hath been said, and then consider very briefly the Exceptions that have been made, or rather the Evasions that are made use of to justify an indefensible cause.

The place is *Matt. 26. 18.* And he (Jesus) said, Go into the city to such a man, and say unto him, The Master saith, My time is at hand, I will keep the Passover at thy house with my disciples. Where the Reason given why he would needs keep the Passover at this man's house was, *Ὁ καιρὸς μὲ ἐγγύς ἐστιν.* My time is at hand: lest the Master of the house should wonder at his mesage, when the time of the Passover was not yet come.

And now, having shewn so plain and so unanimous a consent of the Evangelists, as to the time of our Saviour's last Supper, I am not obliged to expose all the Evasions, in which the Patrons of the *Roman* opinion take shelter; yet, that the thing may appear still more plain, and that I may not seem to avoid any difficulty or any objection, I will consider a little *Bochartus* his Evasions, meddling with others onely so far as they are included in him, or borrowed by him from them; for *Baronius* and *Toletus* have already been considered by *Isaac Casaubon*, in his Exercitations upon the Annals of the former; and *Cloppenburge* has been taken to task by *Lud. Capellus*.

To the first place of Saint *John* he answers, that *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς*, before the feast, is as much as, *ἐν τῇ προεορτίᾳ*, at the entrance upon the feast, or, in the beginning of it; as *πρόλογος* is a part of an Oration, *πρόδομος* a part of an House, *πρόγλωσσις* a part of the Tongue, *προκείμενον* a part of the Hair, *προμετωπίς* a part of the Forehead, *προάστειον* a part of a City, *προτείχιον* a part of a Wall, and the like.

But supposing there were such a word as *προεόρσιον*, which I believe it will be difficult to find, yet I deny *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς* and *προεόρσιον* to be the same; no more is *προτείχιον* and *πρὸ τῆς πόλεως*: and so in the rest of the Instances, the Preposition with the Genitive case annexed being manifestly of greater latitude of signification than any of the



the compound words. It is true indeed that *Greg. Nazianzen* has somewhere put two such words together, as *πρεσβυτηριον ημελεα*, but then he understands it not of the beginning of a Feast, but of the day before it, which will not serve *Bochartus* his turn.

*Dr. Lightfoot*, though with no better success, has deny'd that which ought onely to be deny'd, if any thing ought, and that is, that this Chapter of *Saint John* does any way concern our Saviour's last Supper with his Disciples: But if you consider that this was that Supper from whence *Judas* went out to betray him; that this was that Supper in which he preached Charity and mutual Condescension to his Disciples; which he is found to doe likewise in *Saint Luke's* Gospel; that the story of that Supper which *Dr. Lightfoot* refers to is manifestly contained in the twelfth Chapter of the same Gospel, and that it is not likely we should have two several relations of the same Supper in two several Chapters immediately following one another. Lastly, If you consider that that expression which immediately follows those words, *now before the feast of the Passover*, viz. *when Jesus knew that his hour was come when he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own which were in the world he loved them unto the end*, cannot so properly be applied to any Supper as to his last; you will then easily conclude with me, and with *Grotius*, who in this matter concurs very strongly in opinion with me, that it was indeed his last Supper, and that it could be no other.

To that Text of the same Evangelist, c. 18. v. 28. *they themselves went not into the judgment-hall lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover*: he answers, after several others, that by the Passover is meant the *Chagigah*, or Peace-offerings, which were to be eaten together with the Unleavened-bread for all the seven

daies of the Feast; but to this it is enough to answer, that this is by no means the most natural and easie sense, and therefore when there are other places which in their most genuine and first acceptation do so unanimously conspire to prove the same truth, That our Saviour kept his Passover the night before the *Jews* observed theirs, it ought by no means to be allow'd; but yet (though I am not obliged to put the cause upon this Issue, being supported by so many Authorities besides that of this Text) if so much as one single place can be produced besides this which is in question and must not therefore be alledged to justifie it self, where the word *pesach*, or *πάσχα*, in the singular number, is used for the *chagigah*, or Peace-offering of any of the seven daies of Unleavened-bread, then I will be content to allow that *Bochartus* and those whom he follows in this particular are in the right, notwithstanding that supposing the *chagigah*, or Peace-offering of the daies of Unleavened-bread to be understood in this place by the Passover, yet this would have been no reason of their *not entering into the judgment-hall*, *ὥστε μὴ μιν εἰσέλθωσιν* that they might not be defiled.

For, in the first place, there was not that Purity required to the feeding upon the *chagigah*, which was requisite for the Passover it self, and therefore though the first and last day of the seven were a Sabbath and an Holy Convocation, yet the other five daies were not of a sabbatical nature, as you may see plainly in *Exodus*, where the Institution of this Solemnity is appointed; *sed ita erant Festi*, as *Grotius* expresseth it, *ut tamen essent ex aliqua sui parte ἑρπύσματα*, they were daies of a middle state and condition between the work of the week daies and the Rest of the Sabbath; and if the later *Jews* have taken so solicitous a care by the Rubrick, as I may call it, of their Calendar, to hinder the concurrence of two Sabbaths together, of which I shall speak more by and by, much

much less can we think, as indeed it is not possible to be done, that either they or their Ancestours ever kept seven daies together with a sabbatical strictness of observation.

But, secondly, it is agreed on all hands, If our Saviour did not suffer upon the Passover it self, yet that it was upon the first day of Unleavened-bread, which being a Sabbath, and kept among the *Jews* with all the religion and strictness that can be conceived, it would have been no reason of their *not entering into the judgment-hall*, ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πᾶζα, *that they might eat the Chagigah*, but that they might not be defiled upon the first day of Unleavened-bread, which was so sacred among the *Jews* that there needed no other reason to make them afraid of being defiled. From all which it follows plainly, that by the Passover in this place, the Paschal-lamb in its utmost strictness and propriety of acceptation is to be understood.

To the Text of c. 19. v. 14. *and it was the preparation of the Passover*, he answers, that by παρασκευὴ, or *the preparation*, the Friday in every week was ordinarily understood, which I should readily have granted him, though he had not confirmed it out of *Beresith Rabba* and the *Arabian* testimony of *Gianhari*, with which his admirable skill in Oriental Learning hath supply'd him; but that the Passover, if it happen'd to fall upon a Friday, was ever called παρασκευὴ ἢ πᾶζα, which is that which he and divers others contend for, this is that which I deny, because, first, it must be acknowledged to be precarious, having no Authority of any *Hebrew* Calendar to vouch it; in the second, when the Friday is called παρασκευὴ, it is an elliptical way of speaking, which must be supply'd thus, παρασκευὴ ἢ Σαββᾶτος, and if it be asked, What is meant by those words? the answer will be that, It is *the day before the Sabbath*; and so a man would think.

think, by the same way of construing, that *παραπρωτη* *παρα* was the day before the Passover, and not the very day of the Passover it self: but, thirdly, if the Jewish Calendar must be called in to determine this important Question, which has exercised the wits of so many Learned men, we may remember that, in the sixth of Saint Luke's Gospel, there is mention made of the *second Sabbath after the first*, which in the Greek is called, *Σάββατον δευτερον*, and which, no question, was a day of special remarke in the Calendar of those times; and, because it is very apposite to my purpose, after the vain attempts of Scaliger, Cloppenburge, Capellus and Grotius, I will now give a clear Explanation what is meant by it.

It is plain therefore that the Sabbath being a period or revolution of seven daies, the first Sabbath of *Nisan* must of necessity fall upon one of the daies inclusively of seven; and for the same reason the Passover, being a Feast of seven daies, it must alwaies have a Sabbath for one of the number, which being either the Passover it self, or one of the daies of Unleavened-bread, it was for that reason of greater Solemnity, because it was at once a commemoration of the Divine Rest after the Creation of the World, and of his Goodness in their Deliverance out of the Land of *Aegypt*; and it had, besides the daily morning or evening Sacrifice, the celebration of the Passover, or the *Chagigah*, into the bargain, and this Sabbath is that which is properly called, *Σάββατον δευτερον*, that is, *πρωτον δευτερον*, or rather, *δευτερον δευτερον*, the second Sabbath after the first of *Nisan*, which must of necessity fall either upon the Feast of the Passover it self, supposing the first day of that month to fall upon the Sabbath, or else upon one of the daies of Unleavened-bread.

Now, if you consider how many places of Scripture there are, which have been already produced, which do  
mani-

manifestly favour its falling upon the Sabbath that year when our Saviour suffered upon the Cross; if you consider what Solemnity the conjunction of the Sabbath would add to that of the Passover; if you reflect upon this, that no Execution could be done upon the Feast-day it self, which was a Sabbath, in which it was not lawful to doe any Work, *Exod. 12. 16.* or for the Bodies of men to remain or be upon the Cross, *Joh. 19. 31.* and that upon the first day of Unleavened-bread, in the morning, they that lived at a distance from *Jerusalem* were used to repair to their respective homes, *Deut. 16. 7.* because it not being without great detriment to their affairs that many of them were forced to repair from the uttermost parts of *Judæa* to *Jerusalem*, while God by a Miracle preserved their Flocks and their Substance at home from the IncurSION of the neighbour Nations, *Exodus, c. 34. v. 24.* who, not being miraculously restrained, would have made use of this occasion at once to enrich and revenge themselves for the Injuries they had received, he was pleased, upon so necessary an occasion, to dispense so far with the sabbatical Rest, as to suffer every man to depart to his own home upon the first day of Unleavened-bread, notwithstanding it had in other respects all the solemnity and strictness of a Sabbath; by which means it would have come to pass, if our Saviour had been crucify'd upon that day, that he would not have been slain by all the Congregation of *Israel*, as the Law required the Paschal-lamb to be.

Lastly, If you shall observe, what in this case is very material to be considered, that if our Saviour had not suffered upon the usual time, when the Passover was to be killed, that is to say, upon the fourteenth of *Nisan*, but upon the fifteenth, or upon the first day of Unleavened-bread, he would not in this have represented the Passover, but the *Chagigah*, or Peace-offering, of the days of Unleavened-

vened-bread, neither would he so fully have answered the Legal Types, being no otherwise typify'd by the *Chagigah* than he was by all Sacrifices whatsoever, which though they did all of them point at that great Sacrifice, which was in *the fulness of time* to be offered up once for all, yet the Passover, and the Sin and Trespass-offering had some sort of preheminance above the rest in this umbratical designation, as is manifest from his being called so frequently, *the Lamb*, and *the Lamb of God*, and the *Lamb without blemish*, and *Christ our Passover*; and from his suffering without the Gate, to answer the typical adumbration of the Sin-offering which was for this reason burnt without the Camp; certainly, from all this, you cannot chuse but see it absolutely necessary to confess, that on the year of our Lord's Passion, the first day of Unleavened-bread and the Sabbath were co-incident with one another, and that the *Sabbatum Deuteroprôtum* was alwaies either upon the fifteenth of *Nisan* or else inclusively from that to the one and twentieth.

What the true meaning of this *Sabbatum Deuteroprôtum*, or *the second Sabbath after the first*, as we render it, should be, has been a Mystery which has been hid from Ages, and which it is now my happiness, for the better adjusting the true time of our Saviour's Passion, and for the farther vindication of the Scripture History, which receives at once light and credit by being solidly explained, now first of all to discover.

*Erasmus* upon this occasion gives a pleasant Specimen of Monkish Ignorance, and Saint *Jerom*, (so long ago have Learned men been ignorant of the true meaning of this passage in Saint *Luke*) consulting *Gregory Nazianzen* upon this question, was answered onely with a Jest, instead of giving his opinion. *De vocis δαλεγονταις interpretatione*, saith *Grotius*, *dici ferme potest, quot capita et sententiæ. Syrus & Arabs, Tanto quam nos sumus illi & seculo*



Et seculo Et loco propiores, satis manifeste ostendunt, se, quid hæc vox velit, ignorasse: and of this disagreement among the Ancients, as to the meaning of this place, you may see abundance more in *Isaac Casaubon*, in his fourteenth Exercitation against *Baronius*.

Neither have any of those modern Writers, who have either occasionally or *ex professo* inquired into this matter, succeeded any better than the Ancients have done. *Scaliger's* conjecture, though approved by *Casaubon* and other Learned men, and of which he was very fond himself, is yet, upon account of the harshness of the composition, (which he, being so good a Grammarian, would have understood had it been any man's conjecture but his own,) and for other very good reasons, rejected by *Grotius* and *Ludovicus Capellus*.

*Scaliger's* Conjecture is founded upon *Levit. 23. 15, 16.* And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering: seven sabbaths shall be compleat: Even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath, shall ye number fifty daies, and ye shall offer a new meat-offering unto the Lord. From whence he would needs have it that the Jews were used to count their Sabbaths to the Feast of Pentecost from the second day of Unleavened-bread, after this manner, Σάββατον δ' ἀρεσπρωτον, δ' ἀρεσπ' δ' ἡμεραν, δ' ἀρεσπρωτον, &c. reckoning from the δ' ἀρεσπ', that is to say, the second day of unleavened-bread, but then it should not have been δ' ἀρεσπ' but δ' ἀρεσπρωτον, δ' ἀρεσπ' δ' ἡμεραν, &c.

Secondly, δ' ἀρεσπ' without an adjection would not, nor ever did that can be proved, signifie the second day of Unleavened-bread, but as they say, πρώτη ἡ ἀζύμων, and in another place, ἐκ' αὐτῆς ἡμερᾶς ἡ ἐσπ' ἡμέρα, for the first day of unleavened-bread, and the last day of the Feast, so if they had a mind to be understood, they

must speak out as plainly  $\delta\delta\tau\epsilon\gamma \kappa\pi \alpha\gamma\upsilon\alpha\omega$ , otherwise, what second day, or what second thing, which might be any thing with a feminine gender, was meant, it would be impossible for any man to divine.

Thirdly, In the place upon which this Conjecture is founded, it is not from the second day, but from the morrow; *mimacharath*, in the *Hebrew*; and in the *LXX*.  $\Sigma\mu \tau \epsilon\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\iota\omega\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\upsilon$  so that it is plain, if they had followed either the original *Hebrew* or the Translation of the *LXX*, with which they were better acquainted in those days, and from whence they must have borrowed this way of numbering of their Sabbaths, if any such thing had been, they would not have said,  $\sigma\alpha\beta\beta\alpha\tau\omega\delta\delta\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\pi\tau\epsilon\rho\omega\iota\omega$ , &c. but  $\epsilon\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\iota\omega\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\upsilon$ ,  $\epsilon\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\iota\omega\delta\delta\tau\epsilon\rho\omega$ , &c.

Fourthly, The *Jews* in this case did not count by Sabbaths, but by days; for though it be true what *Moses* saith, that from the morrow after the Sabbath, seven Sabbaths were to be compleat, yet when he speaks of the way of counting these seven Sabbaths he saith, *v. 16. Even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath, shall ye number fifty days*; and so the *Jews* at this day keep their account, saying, the first after *Omer*, the second after *Omer*, &c. till they come to fifty daies, as *Grotius* upon this place hath observed.

Fifthly, and lastly, which I believe has not yet been taken notice of by any other, though it be plain demonstration against *Joseph Scaliger's* opinion, he proceeds upon a mistaken notion of the word *Sabbath*, which in this Text hath two significations, but neither of them such as will serve his turn: for when it is said, from *the morrow after the sabbath*, by the Sabbath is understood the first day of Unleavened-bread, which was, as hath been shewn, of a sabbatical nature, let it fall upon what day of the week it would, and from hence they numbred se-



ven Sabbaths, that is, not seven Saturdays or *Jewish* Seventh-daies, but seven times seven daies; so as, if *Scaliger's* opinion be true, and if the Sabbaths were to be counted after his manner, then it would not be alwaies the Saturday or *Jewish* Sabbath on which the *Sabbatum Deuteroprôtum* would fall, but upon any day of the week indifferently; so, as for example, if the second day of Unleavened-bread were upon the Munday, then the next Sabbath after it, excluding that day, that is, the next sabbatical Period of seven daies would be upon the Tuesday come seven night, and this, according to *Scaliger*, would be the *Sabbatum Deuteroprôtum*, and the Wednesday come six Weeks after would be the day of *Pentecost*.

But now it is plain, that in that Instance of the *σάββατον δευτεροπρωτον*, which the Gospel of Saint *Luke* gives us, it is to be understood of the Saturday or of the *Jewish* Sabbath properly and strictly so called, for otherwise the Cavil of the *Pharisees*, instead of deserving that solid and judicious answer which our Saviour gives to it, would have been ridiculous, and would have needed no answer at all, since a Sabbath in the meaning and sense of that place from whence *Scaliger* borrows his Argument might have been understood of any day of the week, let it be what it would; and though there were no manner of Sanctity in it.

But if either *Scaliger*, had he been living, would have understood, or if any now will needs understand for him, the word *Sabbath* of seven revolutions of the Saturday or first day of the week, and will have it, that the day of *Pentecost* was the day after the seventh or last of these, then let us suppose the Passover it self to be coincident with the Sabbath, in which case the second day of Unleavened-bread will be upon our Sunday, and upon the Munday come seven weeks the fifty daies will be compleat, upon the Tuesday, the first day of the Feast

of Weeks or the first day of the Feast of *Pentecost* ought to fall; but in regard there have not yet been seven revolutions of the Saturday come about, we must stay yet five entire daies longer, that is, five and fifty daies, and the first day of the Feast of *Pentecost* must alwaies happen upon our Sunday, both of which since they are very absurd and contrary to the exprefs words of the Law, which reckons but fifty daies from the second day of Unleavened-bread, let that day happen upon what day of the week it will, it is manifest what is become of *Scaliger's* opinion, of which, as absurd as it is, *Grotius* was pleased to say, *Sententia ista magnis argumentis à suo Authore defensa est*, that it was defended by its Authour by great and weighty arguments, though for some reasons he thought it necessary to dissent from him; and *Casaubon*, speaking of the same Conjecture, saies, *Tantum dicam, Certum atque indubitatum sententiæ Scaligeri Fundamentum esse in verbis Moïsis, Lev. 23. 15.* that is, *I will onely say this, that Scaliger's opinion is grounded upon a certain and undoubted foundation of Levit. 23. 15.* for we have seen how sandy and infirm and rotten that foundation is, and how unable it is to support that little building of a very small conjecture, how great soever in the opinion of its Authour, which *Scaliger* would have built upon it.

*Scaliger's* pretended solution of this difficulty being thus confuted, though in truth much the most ingenious and the nighest to truth of any which have been thought of either before or since him by those who would pretend to substitute a better in its stead: *Grotius* comes next to be considered, and his solution is this,

That the Sabbath-day next before the Passover is at present called by the *Jews*, *Shabath hagadol*, that is, *the great Sabbath*; and that sometimes the same Sabbath is called also *Shabath harishon*, *the first Sabbath*. Now, faith

saith he, there being three great and solemn Feasts among the *Jews*, that is to say, the Passover or Feast of Unleavened-bread, the Feast of Weeks or of *Pentecost*, and the *Scenopegia* or Feast of Tabernacles; it is but reasonable to believe that the Sabbaths immediately preceding the two latter, had also some preheminance above other Sabbaths, as well as that which was immediately antecedent to the Passover it self; and so the order of these three great or first Sabbaths will be thus;

The Sabbath before the Passover is, σαββατον μέγα πρῶτον or σαββατον πρωτόπρωτον.

The Sabbath before *Pentecost* is, σαββατον μέγα δέυτερον or σαββατον δευτερόπρωτον.

The Sabbath immediately preceding the Feast of Tabernacles is, σαββατον μέγα τρίτον or σαββατον τριτόπρωτον.

This is as plain a representation as can be given of *Grotius* his opinion; which after all is exposed to more and greater inconveniencies than that of *Scaliger*, which both he and *Capellus* have rejected.

For, First, granting him what he saies to be true, That the *Jews* at this day do call the Sabbath immediately going before the Passover *Shabath karishon* or *Shabath bagadol*, the great or the first Sabbath; yet this is onely σαββατον πρῶτον, not πρωτόπρωτον, as he would have it, much less are there any foot-steps of the σαββατον τριτόπρωτον any where to be found, which yet hath as great a share in his solution as the other, so that give him all that he desires himself, yet these two, and especially the latter, are perfectly precarious.

Secondly, His argument proceeding from the names now in use in the *Jewish* Calendars to those which obtained in our Saviour's time, it is manifest that this way of argumentation is perfectly fallacious, because if that ancient Calendar had not been lost, there could have been

no controverſie about the true meaning of the σαββατον δὲ θεοπρατον, and if it be perfectly loſt, I do not underſtand how any modern Calendar can help us out in a difficulty which none but the ancient can determine.

But, Thirdly, if the Language of the modern *Jews* muſt be drawn into argument in this caſe, yet it ought to be drawn no farther than it will go; and ſince that has onely pointed out one great or firſt Sabbath in the year, it is unreaſonable upon that authority to eſtabliſh two other of which it is perfectly ſilent, and which, as ſilent as it is, it does very ſtrongly imply that there were no other Sabbaths that went by this name, otherwiſe this Sabbath would not have been called ſimply *Shabath hagadol* or *harifhon*, but *Shabath hagadol harifhon*, the firſt great Sabbath, or *Shabath harifhon min harifhonim*, the firſt of thoſe Sabbaths which are called Firſt.

Fourthly, It is unanſwerable what *Capellus* objects againſt *Grotius*, that his notion of the *Sabbatum θεοπρατον* makes the time of Wheat-harveſt to fall much lower than is conſiſtent either with the cuſtom of that Countrey or with the nature of the ſoil, which is a great abſurdity indeed; for certainly the Diſciples could not well pluck the ears of corn after the time of the Wheat-harveſt was over.

Fifthly, and Laſtly, I ſhall prove immediately againſt *Grotius*, that the *Jews* in their ancient Calendar had a day which they were uſed to call the σαββατον πρῶτον, or *firſt ſabbath*, but that it was not the firſt before the Paſſover, but the firſt in *Niſan*, between which and the Paſſover there muſt alwaies of neceſſity be one Sabbath intervening.

*Grotius* being thus answered, *Capellus*, who has undertaken *Grotius*, comes next in courſe to be confuted himſelf; and though not having his Book at preſent by me, which it is many months ago ſince I read, nor being

ing able to procure it, I cannot so particularly determine what his *Hypothesis* is, yet this, as I remember, is the foundation of it, that it depends upon the double account of the sacred and civil year among the *Jews*, in respect of which *Tisri*, which answers to part of our *September*, was the first month in one account, and *Nisan* in the other; now if it can be proved, with the good leave of the Chronologers, who are universally of another mind, that there was indeed no such difference of account in the *Jewish* year, then *Capellus* his conjecture, which is founded upon this difference, must of necessity fall to the ground.

There are but two waies that I know of by which this different account can be rendred either *probable* or *certain*; it might be thought *probable* if any use of such a difference could be known, but supposing that one year consisted of as many days as the other, why may not one year serve all the purposes both of the sacred and the civil account? and what then will a distinction of names signifie when the thing is the same?

It cannot *certainly* be proved, unless it be by the Testimony of Scripture which is the onely authentick Record in this case, and that is so far from favouring this conceit of a double account that it will perfectly overthrow it. For all the light we have from Scripture is no more than this, that whereas the old year from the Creation began in *Tisri* or *September*, yet in memory of the Deliverance of the *Israelites* from the Bondage of the *Ægyptians* at that time, they were from thenceforward ordered to change the beginning of their year, and to look upon *Nisan* or *Abib* as the first month in the *Hebrew* Calendar; and therefore, though in the History of the Flood *Tisri* is expressly called the first month, yet after the institution of the Passover, whenever its order is mentioned, it is called the seventh, but no where the

first; neither was it ever after this accounted the first month in any respect whether sacred or civil.

To make this out more clearly, you may observe, that all the ancient Chronology proceeded usually by the Lunar year, and from thence it is that the *Jews* had no other name for a month but *chodesh*, from a word that signifies to *renew*, which is a plain intimation that their months were measured by the return of their new moons; in which case one of these three things was necessary, either that their Feasts which were either upon their new moons, or at such a certain distance from them, should run thorough all the seasons of the year, or that in each month there should be some daies added to make an equation with the Sun's motion; or, lastly, that at the end of the year there should be a Lunar month added to set the account even betwixt the Sun and Moon.

The first could not be, because there were some Feasts which could not be celebrated but at such a season of the year; as the Feast of Weeks or First-fruits after all their Harvest-work was over and their Corn inned into their Barns; and the Feast of Tabernacles, after the gathering of their Autumnal Fruits, which two could not possibly be kept at any other time than about Midsummer and Autumn.

The second could not be, because this would disturb the observation of their new moons, by the intercalation of one month's falling upon the new moon of another; it remains therefore, that at the latter end of the year there was an intercalary month, by which the equation between the two great movers was preserved.

Since therefore it is clear that all the *Hebrew* months were Lunar, they having no name for a month but what implies so much, one of these three things must needs be granted; either that those things or actions which were  
used



used to recurre at certain seasons with respect to the Sun, did yet notwithstanding wander thorough all the Lunar months of the year, and did sometimes fall out in this month, sometimes in that, and every year about a month different from the other, so as in twelve years or thereabouts to run thorough the whole course of Lunar months, or else there was a different way of intercalation in the civil year from the sacred; or, lastly, there is no difference between them, but the sacred and the civil years are, as they say, a distinction without a difference, and words invented by Learned men to puzzle themselves instead of informing the World.

For the first of these, since there was such a connexion betwixt things civil or secular and sacred as there was, and since they had such a dependence upon one another, as the waving of the sheaf, which was alwaies to be in *Nisap*, had a dependence upon the earing and ripening of the corn, and the Feast of Tabernacles or In-gathering upon the gathering of their autumnal Fruits, it cannot be questioned but both of these were measured by the same common measure; and to say otherwise is not only precarious, but also very unreasonable, to think that people would perpetually trouble themselves with two accounts crossing and disturbing one another to no purpose.

For the second, besides that it is precarious, and in a manner as troublesome as the other, and that we have no names of months distinct from the Lunar, there can hardly any other intercalation, besides that at the end of the year, be supposed, unless it be an Embolism at the end of every month; which would be to turn the Lunar into a Solar year without any ground, and contrary to the notation of the word *chodesh*, and to make every Solar month in process of time to travell thorough all the names of the Lunar, since every such month does gain some ground upon them.

It remains therefore that this distinction is frivolous and impertinent, and that there is no such real difference as is pretended betwixt the sacred and the civil year.

And now, to confirm what hath been said, I will do these two things: First, I will show by another Argument drawn from the notation of an *Hebrew* word, that the Lunar year was the onely year in use among the *Jews*. Secondly, I will answer such places of Scripture as I imagine may be urged in defence of this double year.

And, First, for the Argument drawn from the notation, it is known very well that in *Greek* one of the names of the *Moon*, from whence we have our *English* word it self, as also that of *Month* derived from it; as the *Latines* have their *Mensis*, and the *Greeks* their *Μην*, is *Min*, which is without question from the *Hebrew* word *manah*, *numeravit*; from whence also the *Arabians* with a *Præfix* have their *Almenick*, or *Almanak*, as we are used to call an *Ephemeris* among us; all which may be sufficient to convince us that the *Jews* had no way of measuring the larger periods of time but by the motion of the Moon, by the multiplication of whose circle so many times into it self, the Solar year was made up, and not by twelve equal Sections of the Solar circle, which by reason of their Feasts and Holy-days depending so much upon the Moon, would have brought all their Chronology into confusion; besides, that it is most natural and therefore probably most ancient to measure the several periods of time, as far as may be, by the perfect and entire motion of one of the Heavenly bodies, as the natural day is measured by the Sun's diurnal circle; the month, by one compleat and perfect revolution of the Moon; and the year, by one entire procession of the Sun thorough all the Signs of the Zodiak or Ecliptick, or by the multiplication of so many Lunar intervals as are



are equal to that larger circle which the Sun describes.

The places of Scripture that come at present to my mind from whence this double account may seem to be justified are two; the first as long before the Law as the Creation it self: *Gen. 1. 14. And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven, to divide the day from the night: and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years.* Which place, because it equally concerns the Sun and Moon, the two great Lights that were at that time created, it may seem that there was alwaies a different account of the Solar and Lunar year, as old as the Creation it self; but to this, an explanation of that Text is a sufficient answer.

*Let them be for signs, LXX. Kai ἐστὼσαν εἰς σημεῖα* which is no question to be understood of that use which the Judicial Astrologers are used to make of the several Aspects and Configurations of the Heavenly bodies, as signs and tokens of future events, not that they are so naturally in themselves, or that they are capable of affording any such use; but that God in his Wisdom foresaw that this use would be made of them by the vain curiosity of inquiring mortals, who will needs be prying into those dark Mysteries of the Book of Fate, which all the Stars of the Firmament can never enlighten.

By their being *for seasons (lemohadim)* two things may be meant, that is, either to point out the solemn and religious Feasts, which all along in Antiquity belonged to the Moon, or to distinguish the several quarters and seasons of the year, which is the natural business of the Sun, and is for that reason expressly attributed to him in Scripture. So 2 *Sam. 11. 1.* and 1 *Chron. 20. 1.* *And it came to pass, after the year was expired, at the time when Kings go forth to battel:* in the Hebrew it is *Letsheboubath haschanah*, and *Lebeth teshboubath haschanah*; i.e. at

the return of the year or of the Sun from the vernal Equinox towards the Equator: And *Exod.* 34. 22. *Vechag haasiph tekouphath hasbanah*, and the feast of in-gathering at the years end, so we translate it; but it should be, at the revolution of the year, that is, at the return of the Sun from the Autumnal Tropic.

But these Lights were not only for Signs and Seasons, but also for days, and years; both of which, though they may indifferently be measured either by the Sun's motion or the Moon's, yet I conceive the earliest Antiquity as well in their account of days as months had a particular respect to the motion of the latter, and that this was one reason, besides what may be taken from the History of the Creation, why they began their natural day in the evening, from this Planet's having the dominion of the night; and as the month was made up as I may say of Lunar daies, so was the year of Lunar months, at least in process of time, when for avoiding of confusion in their Chronological account the motions of the Sun and Moon were adjusted and fitted to one another, as it was by the intercalary month of the *Jews*, which they no question borrowed from the neighbour Nations, among whom the Moon had the Government of their solemn Feasts as well as among the *Jews*; otherwise, to speak properly, every entire revolution of one of the Heavenly bodies is that which is called a year, at least in the language of all the ancient World. For *shanah* in *Hebrew*, what is it, but the repetition of the same motion in the same circle; and *ἐνιαυτός*, is, *ἐν ἐαυτῷ*, because, *in sese volvitur annus*, as the *Egyptians* paint the year by a Serpent whose tail is inserted into his mouth, to signify the ending of a Planetary motion in the point where it began; and the *Latin*, *annus*, is nothing but a great Ring or Circle, from whence the diminutive *annulus* is derived, and may in its true signification equally belong to

to the revolution of a day, a month, or a year ; so that , for ought we know , *shanim* ( *years* ) in this place may be but exegetical of *jamim* ( *daies* ) that went before ; from whence it is that *jamim* in the Plural number does sometimes signifie *years* as well as *daies* , and that the terms of *a day* and *a year* are in the Prophetick style are in a manner convertible with one another. However it is certain , whatever the meaning of this place be , that it has nothing to doe with the distinction of the sacred and civil year among the *Jews* , which depended upon a particular occasion , and was two thousand years younger than the Creation.

But though this place cannot be of any moment in this controverſie , yet there is another which I ſhall now produce , that has a greater ſemblance of argumentation in behalf of this double year , and that is *Exod. 23. 16. Vechag habaſaph betſeth haſhanab* , we render it , *and the feaſt of ingathering in the end of the year* ; and the *LXX. ἐορτὴν συντελείας ἐν ἑσόδῳ τῷ ἐνιαυτοῦ* : now if *Tifri* , in which month the Feaſt of In-gathering was to be kept , were the end of the year , it muſt alſo be the beginning of it , becauſe the year ends and begins together , as hath been ſhewn ; ſo that here we have plainly , after the Law was made , two beginnings of the year , the one in *Niſan* , and the other in *Tifri* : but to this I answer ,

First , That this cannot be , becauſe in the ſacred account , to which the Feaſt of In-gathering muſt needs refer , *Tifri* was not the firſt month but the ſeventh.

Secondly , I take the liberty to ſay , That neither our Tranſlatours , nor the *LXX.* themſelves have rendred this place as they ſhould have done ; for whereas they have tranſlated it in the *end* , they ought to have ſaid in the *beginning* of the year ; not that there were two beginnings of the *Jewiſh* year ; but becauſe the old year from the Creation began in *Tifri* ; the Sun being ſuppoſed by Anti-  
quity

quity first to have set out, when he began his course from the Autumnal Tropick, and it is in allusion to this opinion, which the *Jews* and *Chaldees* had, that this Expression is used, *betseth hasbanah*, that is, *not, in the end, but in the setting forth* of the year or of the Sun; and so the Sun beginning to run his everlasting course is compared *Psal. 19. 5. to a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoicing as a Gyant to run his race*: where what we translate, *coming out of his chamber*, is in the *Hebrew*, *jotse michouphatho*, which is the very word used in the place of *Exodus* last cited. And so in that place of *Samuel* already cited, *the time when Kings go forth to battel* is called *beth iseth hamelachim*, that is, the time not when they *end*, but when they *begin* their expedition.

And thus, I hope, it is abundantly manifest that there were not two several beginnings of the *Jewish* year, and consequently that the ground upon which *Capellus* relies is utterly false and mistaken. But yet I cannot leave this Discourse till I have observed farther that in that Text of the *Psalms* which I have just newly produced, the way or path of the Sun is called *orach*, from which word the Moon in *Hebrew* has its name *jareach*, because by her motion the course of the year was observed; as *Saturn* is called  $\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\textcircled{\text{A}}$ , as it were  $\chi\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\textcircled{\text{A}}$ , there being very frequent commutations in all Languages of a Lene and an Aspirate into one another, because he describes the largest circle and is therefore the greatest measure of time; or else in the ancient Physiologie, which I am very apt to believe,  $\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\textcircled{\text{A}}$  in *Greek*, and *Saturnus* in *Latin*, were the same with the Moon.  $\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\textcircled{\text{A}}$  from the *Hebrew* *keren cornu*, from the *horns* of the Moon, as they are used to be called by us and by the *Latin* Poets.

*Nec nova crescendo reparabat cornua Phæbe.*

And

And *Saturnus*, from *sathar*, *latuit*, because of its so often and so long disappearing, from whence *Italy* was called by the *Latin* Poets *saturnia tellus*, and in common speech *latium*, according to another known Verse of the same *Ovid*.

*Dicta fuit latium terra latente Deo.*

And that it may appear to be more than a fancy, that the Moon was called *jareach* because the course of time was measured by her, you may observe farther that the *Greek* and *Latin* *ἡμέρα* is exactly the same with the *Hebrew orach*, from whence *jareach* is derived, and signified anciently not barely the four and twentieth part of the natural day, as it does usually in the more modern Writers, but any of the seasons or quarters of the year, as you may see it proved by *Isaac Casaubon*, in his *Animadversions upon Athenæus*. And I remember somewhere such a Verse as this, it is either in *Homer* or the *Anthologie*, I know not well whether,

Ὡς ἐν εἰαρινῇ ὅταν γλᾶς ἄλγῃ δόξῃ.

From hence also it was that the Moon was called by the *Latins* *Diana*, because she had the dominion of the natural day among the Ancients which was reckoned to begin in the evening, and by the *Greeks* Ἀρτεμις, that is, either from two *Hebrew* words *erets* and *chamah*, because she receives that light from the Sun which is intercepted and obstructed by the Earth; or else from two *Greek* ones which is more likely, παρὰ τὸ ἄρξαι, τρεῖς, ἄρξαι τέμνειν, because she was the measure of time; for α̃ in the *dorick* Dialect is the same with ω̃ in the *common*, as πρῶτ and πᾶτ are the same.

-----νοῦναι γὰρ ἔλεξαν

Ἀμὺν ὡς πεῖται ματέρις ἐνὶ δρυῖ.

Or, lastly, which I acknowledge to be most likely of all,  
S  
though

though it do not so much favour my opinion it may be, *παρὰ τὸ ἀέρος τέρμεν*, from cutting the Air or Atmosphere, as by the passage of the Clouds in a moon-shiny night the Moon seems to doe with a swift and hasty motion; from which as looking like a pursuit of some game, and from the barking of Dogs, whether it be that they are pleased or offended at her brightness, she was by the ancient Mythologists made to preside over Hunting, and from thence it is that she is called *Cynthia*, that is, *κυανὴ Σεά*, and *Cybele*, from the same Greek word compounded with the Phœnician *bel*, from the Hebrew *babal*; and *Berecynthia*, by adding to the former composition the Hebrew *barach*, *fugit*, to denote the swiftness of her motion; from whence also one of the names of the North-wind, *Boreas*, is to be derived, it being exactly the Participle in *Pohel*, *boreach*; as *Daniel Heinsius*, in his Exercitation upon *Nonnus* his *Dionysiaca*, hath before me observed. And because it may seem harsh and unusual to compound an Hebrew or Phœnician word with a Greek, though in that there be no such absurdity that I know of, it is to be noted that *Σεά* it self, as being the Feminine of *Σεός*, is of Hebrew extract as well as the other part of the composition; for *Σεός* is from *thohu*, by which the primigenial Mass is signified in the first Chapter of *Genesis*; from whence the Heathen Theologie derived all its Gods, as you may see in the Remains of *Hesiod*, *Orpheus*, *Epicharmus*, *Aristophanes*, and others of the ancient Mythologers. From *thohu* is the Phœnician *ṭṭḥ* in *Sanchuniathon*; and from thence the Greek *ἔτος* or *Σεός*, *thau* and *sigma* being easily changed into one another, as may be observed from this, that there is a natural *sibilus* in each of them, wherefore the Jews at this day, in their pronounciation of *thau* at the end of a word, do alwaies melt it into an *s*; and in this very word of which we are speaking it is manifest that it hath been subject to such a permutation; for what the common



common *Greek* calls *ἰδός*, that the *laconick* was used to pronounce *ιδός*. *Hesychius*, *ιδός*, *ἰδός*, *Ἰάκωνος*. and so *Sibylla* is usually supposed to be composed of the *laconick* *ιδός* with the common *Greek* word *βελή*. thus from the *Greek* *Ἰαπῶ* is the *Latin* *sepelio*; from the Nominative case *ἵππος*, the oblique *ἵππου*. from *ἄλς*, *mare*, the *Greek* *θάλασσα*, and the *Latin* *sal* and *salax*; and as *ἰδός* is from *thobu*, so from *choshech* in the same Chapter is that other *Greek* word in the ancient Mythologie *χάρις*; and from *tehom* in the *Hebrew* the *Greek* *θάωμα*; so as the true translation of *tehom rabah*, the great *abyss*, would be in *Greek* by *μέγα θαῶμα*.

And now if we can but prove *κυών* to be as good *Hebrew* as the rest, the business is done. That it is not a *Greek* word I am almost certain, there being no word but *κύω* whence it can be derived, whose signification belongs but to one sex, and that too in common with all other Animals whatsoever. We must take notice therefore that the old *Greek* word was *κυών*, from whence there still remains the Plural Number *κύωνες*, and the compound *κύβαλον*; for that what ever it is, *ὅπερ ἐδεινός ἄξιον βάλλαιαι τοῖς κυσί*. Since therefore *shacan* in *Hebrew* is *consedit*, *habitavit*, *κυών* according to this Etymology will be properly *canis domesticus*, a *mastiff* or *household dog*; as among the *Latines* *lar* signifies both an *house* and the *dog* that keeps it; whence the tutelary Deities of their houses were painted and carved in the shape of *Dogs*, and *latrare* is *quasi larrare*, to make a noise like a *dog*: but enough of this.

Having thus overthrown the Conjecture of *Capellus* as well as of those other Learned men that went before him, I will now, to establish mine own opinion upon a certain bottom, produce a fragment of *Saint Peter* out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, which whether it be genuine or no is very ancient, as being to be found in all the Copies



of *Clemens*, and therefore is of greater authority than any modern Conjecture whatsoever.

The place of *Clemens* is this, *Strom.* l. 6. speaking of the *Jews*, Ἐὰν μὴ σελήνη φανῇ σαββαίον ἐκ ἄγασσι τὸ λεγόμενον πρῶτον, *Unless the moon appear they never celebrate that sabbath which they call the first*, that is, this Sabbath, as all other Feasts, is regulated by the *Phasis* of the Moon: it seems therefore there was a Sabbath among the *Jews* which was called πρῶτον σαββατον, *the first sabbath*: wherefore it having been proved already that they had but one beginning of their year in *Nisan*; and it being farther clear that they reckoned their years by months, and their months by new-moons, this first Sabbath can be no other than the first after the New-moon of *Nisan*; but in regard the reason of this change of the beginning of the year from *Tisri* to *Nisan* depended upon the Deliverance of the *Israelites* from under the *Egyptian* Bondage, which happened upon the fifteenth of *Nisan*, therefore this day in some sense might be called the beginning of the year, and the Sabbath coincident with it, or following next after it, σαββαίον δ' ἀπὸ πρῶτον, that is, πρῶτον ἀπὸ δευτέρου, or δευτέρου ἀπὸ πρῶτου, or δευτέρου πρῶτον, *the second first sabbath*; as in a different respect we may call the Sunday incident upon the first of *January* or next after it, *the first sunday*; and that upon the five and twentieth of *March* or next after it, *the second first sunday*; and this is somewhat like that notion which *Epiphanius* had of this word, for he makes it be the second of two Sabbaths, the one of which is a legal Sabbath, that is, any Feast-day; the other a natural, by which he means the Saturday Sabbath, which was instituted from the Creation: but here is the fault of that solution, that he makes it to be no certain day in every year, but one-ly casual or once in so many years, lighting upon the concurrence of two such Holy-days together; the latter  
of

of which though it be in order second, yet it is in nature and dignity first; the same inconvenience does likewise attend the solution of *St. Chrysostom*, which in other respects is not so good as that of *Epiphanius*; but of all men, unless it be those that have acknowledged their ignorance, who yet in this are to be commended for their ingenuity, *Isidorus Pelusiota* has betrayed the greatest want of skill and judgment in this affair; for he makes the σαββατον δειτεροπρωτον to be δευτερον μιν ἢ παχα, πρωτον ὃ ἢ αζύμων, the second day of the passover, but the first of unleavened-bread, which is impossible and absurd.

Thus have I after the unsuccessfull attempts of so many Learned men, as well ancient as modern, evidently explained what is the meaning of σαββατον δειτεροπρωτον, without supposing any thing which is precarious or which does not sufficiently prove it self.

And since the first sabbath, as it was called, was a day of more than ordinary Festivity, as may be seen by those words of *Clemens*, σαββατον εκ αγασι το λεγμενον πρωτον αγειν in Greek being a word peculiar to Festival solemnities, as agitare is in Latin, it is but reasonable to suppose that the sabbatum deuteroprōtum or second first sabbath was likewise used to be celebrated with the same Joy and Ceremony with the other, as having its name from its relation to it, and being in the sense I have explained a first sabbath as well as the other, it being the Anniversary of that day upon whose account the order of the months was inverted, and therefore indeed had rather a better right to challenge all the solemnity of a Feast-day than the other.

Again, Since it was so that the sabbatum deuteroprōtum must of necessity fall upon one of the daies of Unleavened bread, and since the Solemnity would be much greater if it fell on the first, which was the νηθημερον

of the Passover it self. Lastly, Since *Christ* by this means would in the most signal manner imaginable fulfill the typical adumbration of the Passover, if he died upon the *parasceve* of the first day of Unleavened-bread, coincident with the Sabbath, which was the most solemn Passover that could be conceived; it is manifest from all this, that all these things do mutually confirm and strengthen one another, that the *sabbatum deuteroprôtum* was alwaies the third Sabbath in *Nisan*, that it fell upon the year of our Saviour's Passion upon the day of the Passover it self, and that our Saviour celebrated his last Supper with his Disciples the night before the *Jews* were to celebrate their Paschal-feast.

The last place which *Bochartus* endeavours to evade is that of *Joh. 19. 31. For that sabbath-day was an high day*, which I have already occasionally considered, and proved against him out of his own authorities how widely he is mistaken: I will now onely add to what hath been said already the authority of that place of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who goes on thus, speaking still concerning the *Jews*, ἑτε νεομηνίαν ἄγουν, ἑτε ἀζυμᾶ, ἑτε ἱερῶν, ἑτε μεγάλην ἡμέραν· that is, *that without the phasis of the moon, they neither celebrate a new-moon, nor the daies of unleavened-bread, nor any feast nor high-day*: from whence it is evident that every Holy-day is not properly, in the *hellenistical* Language, μεγάλη ἡμέρα, a great or high day, which is distinguished both from the New-moon, and from a Feast in the general considered, and from the daies of Unleavened-bread, so far as their ἀζυμότης, as I may so call it, or their *unleavenedness*, is onely to be considered; but when such a day is coincident with the Passover it self, as the first day alwaies is, and when upon the seventh there is a more than ordinary Festivity, a Sabbath, and an Holy-convocation, this is that which makes the μεγάλη ἡμέρα· otherwise though  
it

it may be *jom tob*, *dies genialis*, a day of publick joy and gladness, yet it is not a great or high day.

It being so undoubtedly clear that our Saviour's Passover was celebrated the night before that of the Jews, and it being unlawfull to sacrifice the Paschal-lamb at any time but on the fourteenth of *Nisan* between the two evenings, this has afforded new matter for the Wits of Learned men to exercise themselves upon to find out an expedient whereby to make it appear lawfull to sacrifice the Paschal-lamb, which they suppose to have been eaten at this last Supper by our Saviour and his Disciples.

There are some that will needs have recourse to certain *Talmudical* Canons for the more orderly and regular observation of the *Jewish* Feasts; and the rule of the Passover they tell us was *Badu*, that is, that if the Passover happened to fall upon the second, fourth or sixth day of the week, it was transferred to the next day following, especially on the second and sixth, to hinder the concurrence of two Sabbaths together; this was the opinion of *Munster* in his *Annotations* and in his *Kalendarium Hebraicum*, and of *Zegerus* in his *Notes* upon the *New Testament*, and of *Edvardus Livelaus*, an *English* man, once Fellow of *Trinity* College, and *Hebrew* Professor of the University of *Cambridge*, in a *Chronological Disputation* upon this Subject against *Cardinal Toletus*; and, lastly, of *Isaac Casaubon* who follows the other in his *Exercitationes* against *Baronius*.

But though it must be acknowledged that such *Talmudical* Canons there were, yet it is equally true that they are of much later date than our Saviour's time, when they were used, (and for a long time after,) to celebrate the Passover indifferently upon any day of the week, though it should so happen that the Sabbath should be the day before it or the day after, as hath been proved by undeniable Testimonies from the *Talmud* and the *Jewish* Rabbins

*Rabbins* by *Joannes Coch* of *Bremen* in his *Notes* upon the *Massachusetts Sanhedrin*, and after him by *Dr. Cudworth* in his *Learned Treatise* of the *Sacrament*, but most particularly of all by *Bochartus* who has confirmed the *Jewish* Authority by the concurrence of *Christian Writers* both *Greek* and *Latin*, and by the Practice of the *Tessarescaidecatitæ*, who, in imitation of the *Jews*, were used to observe their *Easter* not onely upon the *Sunday*, but upon any day of the week on which the fourteenth day of the month should happen to fall; nay, so little did they scruple the concurrence of two *Sabbaths* together by the *Passovers* being either the day before or the day after the *Seventh-day-sabbath*, that in the *Mishna* in *Pesachim* we have an expresse provision in that case as to the time when the daily *Evening-sacrifice* is to be killed, c. 5. *Chal hereb pesach lehiyoth behereb shabath*, &c. that is, *If the evening of the passover shall fall upon the preparation of the sabbath, then the daily evening-sacrifice must be killed at half an hour past six*, that is, with us, at half an hour past twelve, and it must be offered up at half an hour past seven, or, as we would say, at half an hour past one: and *Epiphanius* in his solution of the *sabbatum deuteroprotum*, of which there hath been so much discourse already, doth manifestly suppose the concurrence of two *Sabbaths* sometimes among the *Jews*, and so doth *S. Chrysostom* and *Isidore* likewise; which solutions of theirs though they have been already considered and exploded, yet if no such concurrence had been ever known, they had not onely been false in themselves, but also built upon a false foundation.

The reason why these *Learned men*, who have stood up in defence of the *Talmudical Canons*, have made the difference between our *Saviour's Supper* and the *Jews* to arise from thence was this, that so it might appear that our *Saviour* did celebrate his *Passover* upon the legal day,

day, whereas the *Jews*, being governed rather by the Traditions of their Masters than by the Law of *Moses*, to avoid the concurrence of two Sabbaths (the Passover that year, as they tell us, happening upon the Friday) transferred it to the next day, and so made a coincidence of the Passover and Sabbath together, but how indefensible this opinion is we have abundantly seen, and I account my self not a little happy, that, after the gleanings of so many Learned men, I have been able to confirm the truth by some new authorities not taken notice of by them.

The second Expedient thought of by Learned men for the solution of this Difficulty is this, that both our Saviour and the *Jews* celebrated their Passover upon the legal time, to the best of their understanding, on both sides, but that they onely differed in their way of computation; our Saviour he went more exactly to work, and computed his Passover from the *συνόδῳ* &c. or *astronomical conjunction* of the Sun and Moon, while the *Jews*, not being it seems so good Astronomers, proceeded onely by the sensible *phasis*, which was about a day after; but to this though it may be sufficient to answer with *Bochartus*, that all this is *gratis dictum* & *sine ullo teste vetustatis*, that it is *spoken without any the least colour of authority to reach it*; yet it is farther true that *Maimonides* does expressly affirm that it was a Tradition of *Moses* from Mount *Sinai* that they should compute their New-moons by the *phasis*, and that as long as the *Sanhedrin* lasted, and all the while the Doctours of the *Mishna* and the *Gemara* lived till the days of *Abijah* and *Rabba*, they had no other way of computation; and so it is also expressly asserted in that passage of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, of which I have already made so much use, *Ἐν μὲν σελῶν φάσιν*, &c. *that the Jews never celebrate any of their feasts or solemn days but they compute them from the phasis of the moon.*



The third Expedient is that of *Ludovicus Capellus*, who pretends, as I remember, to solve the difficulty by the Embolism or Intercalation of a day at the end of the month foregoing, which being observed by the *Jews*, but not by our Saviour, makes the *Jewish* Passover a day later than his: but to this though we may answer as to the former, that it is perfectly precarious, it is onely said and not proved; yet there is one place of Scripture yet behind, which will serve for a sufficient Confutation of all these three Expedients, it is *Job. 13. 29.* when *Judas* went out to betray his Master, it is said of his fellow Disciples, that *some of them thought, because Judas had the bag, that Jesus had said unto him, Buy those things that we have need of against the feast:* which Feast, if it be meant of the Passover, as it can be meant of no other, then we have here an express Testimony of the Disciples themselves, and certainly that is as good authority as can be produced, that the Passover was not yet come: For as for those that expound it of the *Chagigah*, they do not consider that upon the first day of Unleavened-bread, as this must be, if it were not the day before, it was unlawfull either to buy or sell.

But, besides these three, there has another way been thought of, as insufficient in my opinion as any of the former; and that is, that as the *Jews* now a-days do use to keep the fifteenth and sixteenth of *Nisan* both of them with a Paschal solemnity, that they may be sure to avoid a mistake as to the time of the conjunction of the two Heavenly bodies, so from thence there are some that will needs infer that this was the ancient practice, and, at that rate, that night when our Saviour supped with his Disciples was no less the Passover night than that which followed it. But first, it is to be considered, that there is no testimony of antiquity that can be produced to prove that this was the ancient practice, and therefore  
it



it is precarious. Secondly, The ancient *Jews*, if they did practise it, yet the practice of the modern can be no argument to prove it, because what they doe is *propter dubium conjunctionis luminarium*, as *Scaliger* observes, whereas the Ancients went altogether by the *Phasis*. Thirdly, *Maimonides* observes that even in old time those *Jews* that were in captivity, or lived in foreign Countries, were used to observe two days together, because they could not certainly tell what day the *Sanhedrin* at *Jerusalem* had consecrated for the New-moon : But as this exception is an argument that it was not the general practice, so the reason given of it proves, that at *Jerusalem* this custome never obtained; for there they could not be ignorant what day the *Sanhedrin* had pitched upon. Fourthly, When the Friday on which our Saviour suffered is called by Saint *John*, Παρεοικονησεν τὴν πάσχα, the preparation of the Passover, it is certain it could not be the Passover it self, for the preparation was onely in order to it, and was of necessity a day before it. Fifthly, The place of St. *John* which I have produced upon the former head is every whit as good an argument upon this for had that day upon which *Judas* went out to betray his Lord been a Passover as well as that which followed next after it, certainly the Disciples could never have been so silly and so ignorant of their own customs and Nation, and of the Law of *Moses*, as to suspect he was gone to buy any sort of provision at a time when nothing could either be bought or sold. Sixthly and lastly it is an unanswerable argument against this and all other ways of making our Saviour's Supper a properly Paschal or Sacrificial Feast, that He himself was that *Lamb of God* whom all the *mosaick* Passovers represented; and that he might unquestionably approve himself to be so, and unexceptionably fulfill the legal Types, it was necessary that he should suffer at the true time  
when

when the Passover was to be killed, and therefore that true time could not possibly be come when he supped with his Disciples: So that it being clear that our Saviour and his Disciples neither did nor could partake of the Paschal Lamb, properly so called, the question is what manner of Passover it was which he celebrated with them, and I answer that it was that which *Grotius* calleth the *mnemoneutical* or commemorative Passover; and if you would know what manner of Passover that was, you may consult *Buxtorf*, in his *Talmudical Lexicon*, under the word *Aphicomen*, and in his *De Cænæ Dominicæ ritibus & forma*, and *Scaliger* in his sixth *De emendatione temporum*: I will not insist upon it at present in this place, having done it already very largely in some other Papers.

*A Table of the first Sabbaths and second Sabbaths  
after the first.*

Nisan.	Nisan.
Σαβ. 1.	Σαβ. δευ. 15.
2.	16.
3.	17.
4.	18.
5.	19.
6.	20.
7.	21.

---

FINIS.

